The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., JUNE 30, 1904. No. 26.

THE REAL CATHOLIC COLLEGE.

THE *American Ecclesiastical Review* for April contained an article styled "The Ideal Catholic College," and signed with the initials M. D. The same paper had before appeared in the *Dolphin*. But the *American Ecclesiastical Review* added an introductory remark which said: "We should be glad if it (the article) were to solicit comments from readers on the important topic of present Catholic college education." The discussion thus invited on the subject appeared however to be entirely needless, and no one wrote to notice it. But a new effort has again been made in a third Catholic monthly by apparently the same pen to urge the same erroneous views. I think it therefore time to return a kind and clear answer, lest silence might be thought to give consent.

Mr. M. D. has allowed himself, it seems to me, to be carried too far by his noble ambition to improve Catholic colleges. In order to exalt the ideal, he has lowered the real college beyond recognition. This is natural enough for an earnest writer, especially if he is possessed of an exuberant imagination and lively sentiments. The very generosity of his heart will prompt him to admit weaknesses and mistakes in his friends, so as to appear very generous to his opponents.

Yet he should not forget that such admissions may be misunderstood. If what he has published had been spoken in a meeting of Catholic college men, who understand the real superiority of our Catholic schools to most secular institutions around us, he would have done no evil and some good. For instances occur, no doubt, at times of the defects he has pointed out. And if in such a meeting he

municate on those days? Does she not encourage daily devotions during the month of Mary, that of the Sacred Heart, that of the Rosary? etc.

Or will it be said that exercises of devotion become indevout when they are made obligatory? Why then does Holy Church impose the obligation of Sunday Mass for all the faithful, and of the daily office for all her priests? Is the critic so sure that boys as a rule suffer more from routine than grown people? And even if they did, if the morning prayers became mechanical, are they therefore sinful? Do not we, grown people, sometimes say our prayers mechanically, even though we say them freely? There is, no doubt, danger that negligence will attend frequent repetition of any acts; but we do not, therefore, neglect to set daily tasks for students in literary exercises; why should we in spiritual exercises? As Phillips Brooks expresses it: "Routine is a terrible master; but she is a servant we can hardly do without."

Now for the presence of the prefect. If there are to be common prayers at all at any time, is it not proper that a member of the faculty, a prefect, should be present to check occasional thoughtlessness in youths or love of mischief in boys? Is not this a prudent way of preventing the disrespect which routine might engender?

I am surprised to see that the critic contemptuously applies the term "policeman" to the prefect, as if that term were commonly so used by Catholic students. As far as I know, this is done only by thoughtless or ill-bred youngsters, as gamins give ugly names to the guardians of the public peace.

Then too the description of college routine in devout practices is greatly exaggerated. I have spent about forty years in various Catholic colleges in this country; and I have never seen boys led to visits of the Blessed Sacrament "with a prefect at one end and another at the other end of the procession." Nor do I remember to have seen college boys, as he says, "genuflecting with the accompaniment of the prefect's hand-clapping"; though I would not disapprove of this training in the case of little children.

As to daily attendance at Holy Mass, it is certainly the spirit of the Church to inculcate this practice on her members; and this is best done with the young by making it a regular part of their education. I think it was so in pre-Reformation times in all English colleges. As some stones will take no polish, some minds no literary or scientific learning, so some hearts will not take to piety. But these are exceptional cases. Most Catholic students become more or less devout in our colleges; and large numbers remain so through life; and we need devout educated laymen much more than clever men. Nor must it be forgotten that the clery is to be

recruited almost entirely from our Catholic colleges. You can not find vocations to the priesthood except among chaste youths; and to keep them chaste there is no more efficient means than much prayer, and especially frequent communions. These therefore should constitute an important element in Catholic college education.

Our critic complains that "once a month a policeman (!) goes the rounds and hales delinquents to Confession." What does the gentleman wish to be done? I can not think he would abolish general confession and communion days altogether. Nor will he object, I suppose, to their being so frequent as once a month. Whatever he may allow, let us suppose that the appointed day for confession is come. There is a boy who is tempted,—not by his good angel of course,—to shirk the unpleasant duty. The prefect has his eyes open,—as every one must have who has the care of boys, big or little,—and he "hales" the would-be "delinquent," and encourages him to do his manly Christian duty. He pleads God's cause with gentle charity. He uses only moral suasion. I have never known other than moral suasion to be used in such a case. Instead of recognizing in the pious counsellor the disciple of the Good Shepherd, carrying the stray sheep on His loving shoulders to the fold, shall we paint him as a policeman with uniform and club? "*Tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in ipsis.*" This is not the old way of lovers of souls, and I can not make myself believe that the new is the better way.

Nor can I agree with the liberty-loving critic when he writes: "How many—have not been shocked—at the conduct of Catholic students returning home in the cars on the first day of the holidays,"—unless he means how many Pharisees, or well-meaning but ill-informed lookers on. That the youngsters are noisy and demonstrative of their joy on the occasion, I fully admit, and I would not have them otherwise if I could. That some excesses may be committed by thoughtless boys when they are exhilarated by freedom from tasks, prospects of soon meeting parents and relatives, of enjoying swimming and horse-riding to their hearts' content; exhilarated besides, may be, by the consciousness of labor well done, prizes and honors won—all this is very natural and generally free from serious faults. I picture to myself their very guardian angels smiling amid occasional remonstrances. But as to real serious sins, they may be fewer than on other days. Of course, there are black sheep in many a flock. On such an occasion those may give scandal for once who might have repeatedly done so during the year if watchful eyes of prefects had not guarded them from temptations.

This thought brings me to another complaint. The critic is

shocked at the incongruity of "a juvenile wearer of the cassock—looking after the conduct of four bearded veterans anxious for the stolen sweets of smuggled whiskey and contraband tobacco." From an odd occurrence, which must have happened once,—else he would not have mentioned it,—he leads the ill-informed reader to conclude that such is the ordinary discipline in Catholic colleges. But even in that exceptional case, was the discipline there so very bad if such a juvenile could keep the drinkers and smokers within the line of duty? Would he rather have thrown the bearded veterans on their honor, when experience had no doubt shown this to be an insufficient check? I have often seen such characters put on their honor and go to perdition.

The wrong impressions the article is calculated to produce may be lessened if attention is called to the peculiar style that characterizes the whole composition. For this purpose it may suffice to copy a few lines of it without comment. For instance: "All the convicts, I mean students, were driven in a chain-gang to Holy Mass, to prayers, and to everything." Of course, the gentleman is not serious; he does not mean what he says. The next paragraph is headed: "The Puritan Snake," by which name he denotes, he says, some "stern moralists among us" Catholics.

After the gentle critic is through with his fault-finding, he proceeds to propose improvements. These are of two kinds. One kind would, in my judgment, be changes for the worse: the other kind would be no changes at all, but mere approximations to existing features in all the Catholic colleges with which I am well acquainted. Here are some specimens of both.

1. *Changes for the worse.* He writes: "The ideal college..... would limit piety to what is of obligation. We must attend Mass on Sundays and holy-days of obligation; with regard to Mass on other occasions, the Church has left us free, that we may have something of our own to offer, without compulsion, to God." Have not the students plenty of other acts to offer freely; such as sodality meetings, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, the daily Rosary, weekly confessions and communions, etc.?

2. *Good traits, familiar features of such Catholic colleges as I know.* He mentions: A spiritual director who understands college boys, who loves them, and is loved by them; prefects who are in thorough sympathy with the students; the exclusion of "loafers," as he calls them, etc.

What I think would greatly benefit good, well-meaning men, like our liberal-minded critic, men whose experience seems to be limited to a very peculiar class of colleges, would be to travel and see with their own eyes what the majority of our existing Catholic colleges really are. Probably the gentleman will, to his great joy, find upon careful examination that his *ideal* falls far below the present condition of *the real Catholic college.*

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY, CHARLES COPPENS, S. J.
OMAHA, NEB.

WHY SHOULD CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN ENTER NON-CATHOLIC RATHER THAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES?

For three reasons: 1. because they will not lose their faith, provided they know their catechism thoroughly; 2. because they will lead others into the Church; 3. because their faith will even become stronger and dearer to them.

The *Ave Maria* (June 4th) develops these three reasons as follows:

1. "In an address delivered at the recent conference of non-Catholic*) missionaries in Washington, Judge William Robinson, dean of the law school of the Catholic University of America, declared that Catholic young men could pass through any great non-Catholic university without losing their faith, provided they had been rightly trained at home.....

"It is not true, as is often asserted, that the majority of the young men attending State institutions are indifferent to religion, or that the professors, for the most part, are infidels or agnostics. On the contrary, a great many of them are deeply interested in religious questions, sincerely desirous to know the truth, and curious to hear what any one may have to say in explanation or defence of the Catholic religion.....

"The opinion expressed by Judge Robinson is corroborated by President Angell, of the University of Michigan, who says (writing in the *Andover Review*): 'In twenty of the State institutions—from all of which I have facts on this point—it appears that 71% of the teachers are members of churches, and not a few of the others are earnestly and even actively religious men who have not formally joined any communion.....It must be conceded that the pupils in the State institutions are not exposed to much peril from their teachers....'

"It is not true to assert that the higher education of American youth is in the hands of men who sneer at Christianity as 'a creed outworn,' and make ponderous assaults upon it in books and periodicals.....And not every professor or preacher is an anti-Catholic or a bigot....There was a time when tirades against the Church of Rome were freely indulged in by professors and preachers; but that time has happily passed, except with the professors of second-rate sectarian institutions, and preachers whose voices echo only in the backwoods. The sooner we Catholics realize this fact the better. The presence of Catholic students in all our State institutions, and of relatives of converts and friends of Catholics

---

*) The Ave Maria means missionaries to non-Catholics. As we have repeatedly remarked, he expression "non-Catholic missionaries" is absurd.

in almost every large Protestant congregation, is not without effect.....

"As regards Catholic young men, they are in danger of losing their faith only when they cease to practice it. Religion lived up to never dies. Men whose own faith is weak or unenlightened are always in a great dread that other men will make shipwreck of it."

2. "Far from being in any danger of losing their faith, Catholic young men in State State universities, provided they know their catechism thoroughly and are faithful to their religious duties, will lead others into the Church. Knowing their catechism thoroughly supposes capacity enough to be convinced that no fact of science can contradict any truth of religion; that there is an answer for every objection that can possibly be made against the Church, though it may not be immediately forthcoming. Surely Catholic young men old enough to take up a university course must be convinced of this."

3. "Their faith ought to become all the more precious to them by contact with those who do not share it, and all the more strong by combating those who oppose it."

Thus far the *Ave Maria*. It proposes to you, Catholic young men, a noble goal, worthy of your ambition. Learn your catechism, but learn it thoroughly; practice your faith and do not cease to practice it. And then enter some great non-Catholic university. You need not be afraid to make shipwreck of your faith. On the contrary, it will become all the more precious to you and all the more strong. Nay more, you will become "non-Catholic" missionaries, "non-Catholic" apostles!

The *Ave Maria*, published at Notre Dame, Ind., is "a family magazine devoted to the honor of the Blessed Virgin," and "is the only periodical of its kind in the language." We recommend the remarkable article "Catholic Young Men and State Universities" to the serious consideration of the eminent Catholic educators who will hold their annual meeting at the St. Louis University on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of July. According to the circular announcing "The Sixth Annual Conference of the Association of Catholic Colleges," the first paper to be read and discussed will be: "Statistics of attendance of Catholic College Students at non-Catholic Colleges and Universities and the Causes thereof," by Charles P. Neill, Ph. D., Catholic University.

* * *

REAL AND APPARENT DEATH IN RELATION TO THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

4. In case of sudden death, life lasts probably up to the time when putrefaction sets in. This is true not only in cases of drowning, hanging, death by lightning or electricity, etc., but also apoplexy, epilepsy, hysteria, hemorrhages, intoxication, poisoning, cholera, pest, etc. For of all these cases so many instances are adduced of returning to life and health by the use of proper restoratives, that no other criterion of real death is admissible than putrefaction. Before putrefaction has set in, it remains probable that the victim is alive still or it is at least doubtful whether he is dead; consequently he may be absolved conditionally and receive extreme unction.

Proofs for this assertion are given abundantly by *Razòn y Fe* (No. xxxiii, pages 99 sq.) where amongst others a case is cited of a man returning to life after being one hour under water, and of a soldier who was apparently dead for twelve days in consequence of hemorrhages caused by wounds.

Hence, practically, in all such cases the priest must proceed as if the man were still alive.

In those dying of protracted illness, life remains at least for half an hour after death has apparently set in. When the patient has drawn his last breath, a physician may be justified in saying that death has set in, or is sure to set in after a short while; yet even in these cases it is of interest to know when it really does set in. Capellmann, Noldin, Villada, and Alberti believe the patient is dead after six minutes. In the XVII. century, some held to a quarter or half an hour; in the XVIII., Lacroix quotes physicians who thought death would surely set in after half an hour; while Father Ferreres in *Razòn y Fe* would not condemn any one for extending the limit beyond half an hour, for the following reasons:

As it is commonly admitted that life continues for some time after death has apparently set in, and as no physician has any certain signs of death outside of putrefaction and, perhaps, cadaveric stiffness, a priest called upon, and arriving after the patient has seemingly drawn his last breath, is justified in treating him as if he were yet alive; the more so as it is evidently better to treat a dead person as a living one, than to treat a living one as dead. For there have been cases where persons, after passing through diseases ordinarily ending in death, have been brought back to life and the full enjoyment of their senses. (Cf. *Razòn y Fe*, ib., pp. 103—107.)

If this is true of death caused by ordinary diseases, it is still more true of such deaths as are caused suddenly by a complica-

tion of diseases. Here we may assume that life continues not only for another thirty minutes, but for one or two hours after the last breath has been drawn. Consequently, a priest is justified always, or almost always, in administering the sacraments of penance and extreme unction conditionally, so long as putrefaction is not manifest.

Although conditional absolution should precede the administration of extreme unction, it is really of more importance to administer the latter than the former sacrament. For, according to theologians, at least some sensible manifestation of repentance in the dying is required to produce, with absolution, the effect of the sacrament of penance, while extreme unction requires no such signs; its effect is assured if the other conditions required for penance are present.

Hence, after giving conditional absolution, extreme unction should always be administered. Bystanders may wonder at such unusual action on the part of the priest; but that can not be a reason for the priest to omit it. To gain time he may use the formula: "Si vivis, per istam sanctam unctionem et suam piissimam misericordiam, indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti per sensus, visum, auditum, odoratum, gustum et tactum," anointing each organ as he mentions it.

But from such a proceeding laymen should not draw the conclusion that it is time to call the priest when a person has drawn his last breath. The object of this paper, and those which have preceded it on the same subject, is simply to call attention to what possibly may be done in cases of extreme emergency.

* * *

MINOR TOPICS.

The Catholic Federation and Politics.—At a public meeting held under the auspices of the American Federation of Catholic Societies the other Sunday at Carnegie Hall, New York, Archbishop Farley said (*Catholic News*, xviii, 35):

"I know that one objection that has been made to the Federation is that it would form a class—a Catholic party—and enter politics. On that moment it would sound its deathknell. On that moment my approbation, and that of many others who are here to-night, would be withdrawn. On that I wish never to be mistaken."

While it is well for the Federation to guard against becoming a "political party" in the ordinary American acceptation of the term, it must have something to do with politics if it hopes to accomplish many of its important objects.

At the same meeting in Carnegie Hall, President Minahan said:

"The objects of the Federation are to agitate the question of sectarian schools and to receive proper recognition for Catholics along many lines. Under the head of religious objects the Federation groups the questions of education through Catholic schools and universities, literature and emigration, homes for Catholic sailors, etc. Among social questions, the labor problem and the question of divorce are made the most prominent, while under civil questions the religious rights of Catholics, taxation of Church property and protection of Catholic civic rights are made prominent."

The *Freeman's Journal* (No. 1703), from which we take this latter quotation, discusses the whole question judiciously as follows:

"These, needless to say, are excellent objects, very proper to be taken up by the Federation, but how, except through political action, can they be promoted or attained? How, without 'politics,' can Catholic claims in the matter of education be urged or Catholic views in regard to any questions affecting their civic rights be carried into effect? Legislation means politics, and it is through legislation that civic rights are obtained and protected. A writer in a French paper, deploring the conditions in his own country with respect to religious rights, makes a comparison as follows with the state of things in a neighboring country: 'The contrast on both sides of the Vosges is striking. While France is driving Jesuits and other religious orders away, Germany is opening her doors to them; while the eldest daughter of the Church wages upon Catholicism a war without mercy or respite, Protestant Germany protects Catholic interests, respects the Holy See, maintains and increases the power of the clergy and combats secularizing factions. France expels the congregations. Germany recalls them and repeals old decrees that seem to her unworthy of a State claiming to respect individual liberty and solicitous of promoting the interests of the Fatherland. In France the Catholics are oppressed, in Germany they triumph.'

"They triumph in Germany because they are well organized and make their influence felt in politics; in France they are oppressed because they do not take the political means to resist the oppression. In constitutionally governed countries the ballot box is the agency by which civic rights are protected, and the ballot box is politics."

The Genus "Hobo."—A comparison of authorities by the University of Missouri shows that the people of the United States pass out annually through their back doors nearly $10,000,000 worth of old clothes and cold victuals to the 46,000 "tramps" of the country. Surprising as it may seem, ninety per cent. of the American "hobos" are married. "Driven from home by their wives," is the comment of one of the Missouri species. Fifty-nine per cent. of these "Weary Willies" have a trade or profession and could make a decent living, had not this irresistible antipathy for work seized them. We Americans usually pat ourselves on the back when talking of this part of our population and speak wisely about the restriction of foreign immigration, but statistics show that over fifty per cent. of our tramp population is of American parentage.

What makes all our tramps? Statisticians tell us that sixty-

three per cent. of them are made so by intoxicating liquors. "Women," says the tramp, "have done more to keep me down than any other evil. Fast and designing women I have reference to."

How are we to get rid of our tramp population? The tramp, himself, would solve the problem this way: "Create a demand for mechanics and labor in this country, and the problem will solve itself, and then if men are found begging and out of work, the authorities can find a job and the great tramp and hobo nuisance of the United States will be settled."

Dr. Chas. A. Ellwood, of the sociology department of the University of Missouri, would put these thirsty fugitives from work and soap on "reformatory industrial farms where they must abstain from drink, must work, and must keep clean for an indefinite time." He thinks they might in this way be made to nearly or quite support themselves and thus cease to be a burden upon those who toil.—

We print the above item as it has reached us from the University of Missouri, but we can not help adding the remark that it seems strange that an institution of higher learning should be content with such a shallow and one-sided treatment of a subject which has a deep sociological foundation and a grave importance in our social life.

The Training of the Young Priest in Pastoral Theology.—In his admirable conferences on the Apostolic life, published posthumously under the title 'The Young Priest,' the late Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster makes a suggestion with regard to the training of the clergy, which strikes us as particularly sane and timely. "It were greatly to be desired," he writes, "that the period of preparation for the ministry could be systematically lengthened. The advantage of two or even three additional years given to study in Rome or elsewhere after the ordinary curriculum would tell powerfully on the spiritual influence a priest would exercise over his flock. I have myself felt keenly that I have been rendering a real service to souls when I have been able to keep a young priest back to enable him to pursue his studies and his spiritual training for two or three years after his ordination. Our Lord began his active ministry at thirty, and this no doubt was, like all else He did, for our example and instruction. But short of so far reaching a change which we can not expect to become general, except under special circumstances, it would be highly desirable to give to every young priest a period of at least from six to twelve months, during which he might be, as they say, feeling his feet and deliberately preparing his soul by study, reading, and prayer for a life of Apostolic perfection. For this a house of pastoral theology, under some experienced priest, or apartments in the Episcopium under the eye of the Bishop, as in ages of greater faith and fervor, would be needed. But this is by no means impossible. Experiments in this direction have been made in different dioceses during the last thirty or forty years, and if they have not been altogether successful, they need not discourage us. We can see where mistakes have been made, where a provision and remedy is needed, and what is required to make the system work

smoothly and profitably. The difficulty, of course, is to find a suitable head. But even here we need not be dismayed if we find something less than perfection. Far more important is the grounding of our men, while in the central seminaries, in a good Apostolic spirit and in a humble and docile mind, than the finding of a genius or of a saint to put at the head of such an undertaking." ('The Young Priest,' pp. 5–6.)

Financial Unsoundness of the "Western Catholic Union."—In his recent lecture to the C. K. of A., Archbishop Glennon said: "It is little less than criminal for a Catholic society to declare that it can insure all its members for amounts much greater than it expects these members to pay."

In a communication to the official organ of the Western Catholic Union (*Western Catholic*, Quincy, Ill., vii, 36), Mr. J. W. Freund applies this test to that organization. He writes:

"At the age of 18 to 25 we assess $8.40 per year. The life expectancy is 42 years. Each member would pay in this time $352.80 and receive $1,000. Are we not promising much more than we expect members to pay? We are promising to pay just about three times as much as we expect to receive! That is according to His Grace's opinion 'little less than criminal!' Will we continue these criminal tactics after being warned by such authority?

"Do the rates proposed by our special committee meet the requirements? Let us see. The proposed rate at the age of 30 to 32 is $1 per month or $12 per year. The life expectancy is 35 years. A member will pay in this time $420 for a $1,000 policy. At the age of 44 the rate is $19.80 per year. With a life expectancy of 25 years each member pays $495 for $1,000. So in any case we promise more than twice as much as we can reasonably expect to receive, and I ask the members of that special committee whether in their honest opinion that isn't 'much more than they expect the members to pay,' and whether our business transactions must not be branded as 'little less than criminal'?"

The financial instability of the W. C. U. was demonstrated by our esteemed contributor Rev. J. F. Meifuss already some ten years ago. But the warning was not heeded. We hope Mr. Freund's admonition will awaken the sleeping members to a realization of the perilous situation of their society.

Ex-Rev. Thomas J. Hagerty, Socialist.—We have repeatedly been asked for information about "Rev." Thomas J. Hagerty, who for some time has been going about the country seeking lecture engagements from labor unions and preaching Socialism wherever he was given a chance. In the *Catholic Columbian* of Columbus, O., (vol. xxix, No. 25, June 18th) we find in a letter from Rev. W. S. Kress, of the Cleveland Apostolate, the following statement, which we would advise our clerical subscribers to preserve, as it may be of good use to them some day when this unfortunate ex-priest bobs up in their neighborhood:—

"Father Hagerty claims to be a priest in good standing; but a diocesan priest without a diocese or bishop, who is not permitted to say mass or perform any of the other offices of the priesthood, is not only not a priest in good standing, but is a priest without any standing at all. He is as much a silenced priest as his brother

Socialist, the Rev. Thomas McGrady, who was suspended on Dec. 10th, 1902, for 'refusing to retract some of his wild doctrines.' The last place to which Father Hagerty was assigned as a priest in good standing, according to Wiltzius' Directory, was in New Mexico in the year 1902. A letter from the secretary of the Archbishop of Santa Fe, dated March 9th, 1903, disowns him and disclaims all responsibility for his doings and utterances. At Brockton, Mass., in November last, Hagerty stated in public that he would give $1,000 to anyone who could prove that either he or McGrady were silenced. I read and then offered to place the documents that proved my title to the thousand dollars in the hands of anyone of my audience, promising a commission of $999.50 for its collection. I am still looking for my 50 cents.

"That such men can not speak for the Catholic Church or expound her doctrines is evident."

The Growing Preponderance of Women Teachers and Students.—The *Educational Review* for June discusses the question of the great preponderance of women teachers in our schools, adverted to by the Mosely Education Commission as having a tendency to feminize school-boys. During the last twenty years the number of women teachers in the schools of the United States has doubled, and meanwhile the number of men has fallen off by about one-quarter. In the schools of the cities of the Union 93% of the teachers are women. In the whole history of education there has been nothing before like to this condition, and it has only taken place in this country during the last generation.

Another fact brought out in this review is very striking. It is that among students also there is a preponderance of the feminine. In the public high schools of the Union there are three girls to two boys; in New York four to three; in Chicago two to one, and in Philadelphia even four girls to one boy. In colleges where a few years ago there were no young women, these make up now a quarter of the students; in coeducational institutions they have increased from 51% in 1880 to 71% in 1900. We are told of a "commercial high school in Philadelphia, devoted to specific preparation for business pursuits, filled with 1,500 girls and not a single boy." This would seem to be an incredible statement, but the reports of the Board of Education are adduced as authority for it.

It needs no argument to show that this is an unhealthy condition, which is bound to have other evil consequences besides the feminization of our school-boys referred to by the Mosely Commission, and the lowering of the marriage rate, deplored by the N. Y. *Sun* of June 12th, to which we owe the above statistics.

A Doctor's Warning Against Serums.—Dr. C. S. Carr, the editor of *Medical Talk* (v, 9) warns his readers against the various serums and vaccines. "The only way to keep safe from the consequences of their use," he says, "is to let them entirely alone. Do not use them. We hope all the fathers and mothers who read *Medical Talk* will resolve at once that never will they allow any such thing to be used in their families. Draw the line on vaccination and serums. The writer lost his only son by the use of one of these horrible serums. Overurged, and in a moment of despair, with three strong physicians insisting upon the operation, he allowed

the dastardly deed of injecting serum for diphtheria to be done. The boy died instantly. The injection was not completed before the boy was dead. Ten minutes before he had been talking to different members of the family, and although weak and desperately ill with something resembling croup, he had his senses perfectly, and no thought of his dying had been entertained. There, in the presence of the dead body of his only son, the writer vowed that so long as he had voice or pen he would never cease to cry out against this murderous business. We, therefore, beseech parents who love their children to protect them from all serums, from every sort of blood poison contrived to prevent or cure disease."

A Representative Catholic?—From a clergyman in the city of Newark, N. J., we have received the subjoined communication:

"Some time ago you spoke of Ex-Senator James Smith, Jr., of Newark as a great advocate of parochial schools. In the recent 'History of Catholicity in New Jersey,' by Dean Flynn, it is shown that were it not for the selfish conduct of Smith, there were in 1892 excellent prospects of getting State aid from the N. J. legislature for our parochial schools. Smith practically had the bill killed when there were enough votes in favor of passing it. He wanted to be United States Senator and was afraid the passage of the bill would hurt him. Again: though a trustee of Seton Hall, Smith withdrew his son to send him to Princeton. It is asserted that he spoke in private disparagingly of Catholic education—as being not up to date with Protestant colleges, socially inferior, etc. When he was preparing to send his son to Princeton, he resigned as a trustee of Seton Hall, but Rev. Stafford, the president, would not accept it."

If this statement is true (and we have no reason to doubt it) it seems all the more remarkable that ex-Senator Smith was recently honored, at the commencement of Seton Hall College, by the presentation of the Knights of Columbus honor medal. We find a detailed report of the celebration in the *Newark Evening News* of June 15th. From Msgr. Stafford's presentation address we gather that Mr. Smith received this medal for his distinguished services to the Catholic cause, with the consent of the bishops of Newark and Trenton.

What are we to think of all this?

Our Starving Dependency.—According to an editorial in the Philadelphia *Record* of the 18th of June, the poor natives of Porto Rico are "dying of hunger." Connection with the United States has deprived the islanders of a market for their coffee, which formerly went to Spain, and at the same time under the "blessings" of the Dingley tariff has increased the prices of all necessaries of life to exorbitant figures. Even the official reports of the insular Board of Health are compelled to recognize and publish the fact that "chronic anæmia, superinduced by malnutrition," is a frequent cause of death. (That means "starvation," in plain English.)

Did that happen to Armenians under Turkish, or to Jews under Russian rule, the American public and our energetic administration would promptly consider the necessary means to remedy such "a disgrace to civilization." Since it only concerns a million

Catholics "benevolently assimilated" by Uncle Sam "for their improvement," even the watchful opposition newspapers, with but a few exceptions, ignore the matter.

What do the Catholics of the United States say to this latest example of "American Imperialism"?

——It is difficult for the modern Protestant preacher to know just where to stop in borrowing from the Devil. Not all are so moderate as Wesley, who wanted only his pleasing tunes. Few, however, have equalled the Rev. Samuel P. Montgomery of the Jefferson United Presbyterian Church at Gill Hall, a suburb of Pittsburg. Others may convert their churches into theatres, but he goes the whole length and transforms his pulpit into a prize ring. According to the N. Y. *Evening Post* (June 11th), "in the presence of his congregation, at the close of a sermon on 'The Peacefulness of David,' the reverend pugilist proceeded to enact Goliath to the David of one of his elders. There was peculiar appropriateness in this assignment of parts, the elder being, like the son of Jesse, a musician—that is, the choir leader. History reversed itself this time. Goliath knocked David down twice and left him senseless behind the organ, and the effect was heightened by his throwing the elder's mother over the pulpit steps. The Rev. Mr. Montgomery, it is stated, has been acting as agent for a mining company, and his choir leader seems to have objected and to have blocked some sales of stock. But if the affair at Gill Hall calls attention sharply to this particular phase of clerical activity, the elder will not have been pummelled in vain."

——The German-speaking Catholics of this country may be proud of the compliment recently paid to their religious zeal by the Rt. Rev. Charles H. Colton, Bishop of Buffalo. In a letter to the German Catholic State Federation of New York, dated Buffalo, May 12th, 1904, His Lordship says: "I have always admired the fidelity of German Catholics to their faith. A German Catholic is a good Catholic or nothing. He is faithful to the teachings of Holy Church, faithful to her sacraments, and self-sacrificing in the building of churches and schools and in maintaining them."

——It seems to me to be a very poor compliment to Our Lord to be making continual compromises with His enemies, or to adopt an apologetic and deprecatory line with the world, when we ought boldly to love and serve Him in preference to all else beside, and to let men see that we are not ashamed of the Gospel; *Non enim erubesco Evangelium* (Rom. i. 16).—Cardinal Vaughan.

——To regard marriage as a sacrament of the church, not within the jurisdiction of legislative enactment or man-made laws, is the attitude of a large proportion of the Christian church. It begins to look as if it would have been better for the morality of the family if this view of marriage had been strictly adhered to.—*Medical Talk* (non-Catholic) v, 9.